



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/553,418 | 10/17/2005 | Patrick Alexandre | 125378 | 1510 |
| 25944 | 7590 | 08/27/2007 | | |
| OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320 | | | EXAMINER MACNEILL, ELIZABETH | |
| | | | ART UNIT 3767 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 08/27/2007 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/553,418 | Applicant(s) ALEXANDRE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Elizabeth R. MacNeill | Art Unit 3767 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Elizabeth R. MacNeill. (3) _____

(2) Alan Webb. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 22 August 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hitchins (6,017,330).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner maintained that in a broad interpretation the power head of Hitchins could be interpreted as an "injection nozzle" and suggested adding language that the active substance is ejected through the nozzle. The examiner also directed the applicant to US 2004/0054336 to Klint as a possible prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

KEVIN C. SIRMONS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Kevin C. Sirmons

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Elizabeth R. MacNeill
Examiner's signature, if required